

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF VIRGINIA  
ROANOKE DIVISION**

**JOVANNI M. TAYLOR**  
also known as JOVAN,

Plaintiff,

V.

C. SHELTON, ET AL.,

Defendants.

Case No. 7:20CV00497

## OPINION AND ORDER

By: James P. Jones  
United States District Judge

Plaintiff Giovanni M. Taylor, also known as Jovan Taylor, has filed a “Motion for Injunctive Relief” that the court has construed and docketed as a motion seeking a preliminary injunction. After review of the motion and the Amended Complaint, I conclude that the motion must be denied.

The Amended Complaint alleges that Taylor was assaulted in May 2020 by a female correctional officer who later retaliated against Taylor for filing complaints about the incident. Taylor also alleges that other defendants failed to conduct an adequate investigation. The defendants have waived service, and their response to Taylor's claims is due to be filed soon.

In the present motion, Taylor raises entirely new allegations about events that occurred beginning in November 2020. In brief, Taylor states that an officer delivered a piece of legal mail that was not sealed. Taylor claims that someone

opened the mailing outside his presence and that the incident violated prison policy and constitutional rights and caused Taylor to suffer emotional distress. Based on these allegations, Taylor moves for a preliminary injunction directing officials to transfer him to a different prison.

“[A] preliminary injunction may never issue to prevent an injury or harm which not even the moving party contends was caused by the wrong claimed in the underlying action.” *Omega World Travel, Inc. v. Trans World Airlines*, 111 F.3d 14, 16 (4th Cir. 1997). Thus, to warrant interlocutory relief, the movant “must necessarily establish a relationship between the injury claimed in the party’s motion and the conduct asserted in the complaint.” *Id.* Taylor fails to state any facts showing that official conduct described in the motion for interlocutory injunctive relief was caused or motivated by the official conduct alleged in the amended complaint.

Because Taylor asks for interlocutory relief not clearly related to the claims in his amended complaint, the court cannot find that he is entitled to the extraordinary remedy he is seeking and will deny his motion. Accordingly, it is **ORDERED** that Taylor’s motion, ECF No. 17, is DENIED.

ENTER: May 20, 2021.

/s/ JAMES P. JONES  
United States District Judge